



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,950	07/29/2002	Helge Schmidt	KSN0024	2570

7590

05/22/2003

Eric J Groen
Baker & Daniels
Suite 250
205 West Jefferson Boulevard
South Bend, IN 46601

EXAMINER

ZARROLI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/049,950

Applicant(s)

SCHMIDT ET AL.

Examin r

Michael C. Zarroli

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with th correspondence address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2002 .
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5 .
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the cross-hatching of the insulative parts indicate a metallic material. For a non-conducting material, the cross-hatching should include alternating thick and thin lines. See 37 CFR 1.84 (h)(3) or MPEP 608.02. Correction is required and will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Sections headings per U.S. practice need to be entered.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim should be broken into paragraphs. Appropriate correction is required.
6. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase “in that plastics materials is injection molded thereto” is grammatically awkward. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 there is an antecedent problem with the limitation “multiplicity of contact elements.” Is the first recitation of this limitation the same as the second? The examiner will interpret each recitation as being the same. In addition, isn’t a multiplicity of elements redundant?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12, 16-17, 19-20 and, 22-24 (as best understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pope et al (US 5921787).

Pope discloses an electrical connector with contact elements (14) and one or more modules (10, 11). Each module comprises a contact support (19) with contact elements connected to the support (fig. 3) and extending along its

surface (fig. 2). Pope also discloses that these elements and supports are connected in a non-releasable manner (fig. 3a).

Regarding claim 2 Pope discloses that the contact elements are metal strips (col. 6 lines 55-58).

Regarding claims 3 and 4 Pope discloses that the front ends of the contact supports do not have contact elements but they do have tapers (unnumbered figure 3).

Regarding claims 5 and 6 Pope discloses that the contact elements project beyond the rear of the support and that they are bent (15a figure 3).

Regarding claims 9 and 10 Pope discloses that the contact elements have a resilient protuberance (15) that is meant to act as contact locations.

Regarding claim 12 Pope discloses that the contact supports have groove-like recesses for the contact elements (fig. 1).

Regarding claims 16 and 17 Pope discloses that in the assembled state the modules are inserted between components (fig. 3a).

Regarding claims 19 and 20 Pope discloses that the modules are enclosed by housing parts (fig. 1) and that this housing encloses the front end of the modules (fig. 3).

Regarding claim 22-23 Pope discloses that the connector is mated with a complimentary connector after precentering (fig. 3a).

Regarding claim 24 Pope discloses that the connector is designed to be soldered to the circuit board using PSGA technology (col. 2 lines 15+).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 7-8, 11, 13-15, 18, 21 and, 25-27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The bent sections of contact lie in a cavity. These contacts are inserted into groove recesses of the contact supports and connected to the supports by injection molding. The connector modules are movable relative to each other.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The U.S. patents listed in the PTO-892 all show contact elements very similar to the one's of the claimed invention.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Zarroli whose telephone number is 703-305-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 3:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Feild can be reached on (703) 308-2710. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Michael C. Zarroli
Examiner
Art Unit 2839



MCZ

May 19, 2003